

|  |                                      |                                       |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/893,357 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>DICKMAN ET AL. |  |
|  | <b>Examiner</b><br>Tracy Dove        | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1745               |  |

**Applicant(s)**

DICKMAN ET AL.

## Art Unit

1745

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time:

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

## Part I.

*Prior art rejections in view of Edlund et al. (US6,375,906) and 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup>, issues not of record.*

1-86

Edlund et al. US6,375,906 and Edlund et al. US2002/0119353

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed restriction requirement of 11/30/04. Examiner stated if the product claims are indicated as containing allowable subject matter, it appears the method claims would be rejoined with the product claims. Applicant pointed out Edlund '906 does not teach both the water stream and the carbon-containing stream are liquid when added to the reservoir and remain liquid when the mixed liquid streams exit the reservoir to be delivered to the fuel processor. Applicant pointed out col. 3, lines 61-col. 4, lines 7 and col. 4, lines 53-57. Examiner agrees that Edlund '906 does not teach this limitation. The claims have been amended to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112 issues..